REMARKS

Pending Claims

    Claims 1 and 6 are pending. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended.   No new matter has

been added.

Claim Objections

    Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to remove the acronym, thus overcoming the

rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

    Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bowen, U.S. Patent No. 6,691,301, in view of Panchul et al, U.S. Patent Publication No.

2001/0034876, further in view of Hines, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0246682, further

in view of Curtis, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0051064, further in view of Nakuta et al,

"Deriving Parameter Conditions for Periodic Timed Automata Satifying Real-Time Temporal

Logic Formulas".

    Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the foregoing

amendments to claims 1 and 6 and for the following reasons.

    Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to clarify that the intermediate expression

comprises a temporal automation and a concurrent control flow flag , and a concurrent control

flow flag generated by expressing the start of the "synchronized" operation as a node which is

labeled as "Begin sync" and the end thereof as a node which is labeled as "End sync",

wherein the temporal automaton is converted from the concurrent control flow flag in which a

part held between description the "Begin sync" and the "End sync" are identified, and is set as

a "sync" block, a clock boundary node which does not exist in the "sync" block is set as a

state allotment candidate. The amendments to claims 1 and 6 are supported in the

Specification on page 35, lines 3-9 and page 41, lines 12-17, for example.

The Office Action states that the primary reference of Bowen fails to disclose the

intermediate expression claimed by applicants. Applicants respectfully assert that none of the

secondary references of Panchul, Hines, Curtis or Nakata discloses this aspect of the claimed

invention. Applicants' comments regarding the Bowen, Panchul and Hines references are set

forth in the Amendment filed May 19, 2009 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Regarding the Curtis and Nakata references, which are relied upon in the rejection,

Applicants note that Curtis is relied upon for disclosing the development of a system wherein

the rate of communications traffic within the system is controlled through imposing an

inhibition of dynamic instantiation restriction and an inhibition of a start method call from the

run method restriction on the program descriptions by employing a Java program language.

However, Curtis does not disclose the intermediate expression that comprises a temporal

automation and a concurrent control flow flag as set forth in amended claims 1 and 6.

Nakata is relied upon for disclosing a symbolic model checking method for parametric

periodic timed automata. However, Nakata does not disclose the intermediate expression

claimed by applicants which comprises a temporal automation and a concurrent control flow

flag as set forth in amended claims 1 and 6. Therefore, the combination of Bowen, Panchul,

Hines, Curtis and Nakata does not render the invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

      In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of

Allowance be issued in this case.

                           Respectfully submitted,

                           Mattingly & Malur, P.C.

                           _____/John R. Mattingly/_____
                           John R. Mattingly
                           Registration No. 30,293
                           703/684-1120
Date: December 22, 2009